

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1 and 18-20 and leaves claims 2-6, 9-14, 17 and 21 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-6, 9-14 and 17-21.

Applicants note that on page 7 of the Office Action the Examiner indicated that claims 17 and 21 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Sax for the courtesy extended during the interview of January 11, 2005. During such interview, an agreement was reached as to the amendments necessary to the claims so as to "overcome the prior art of record". The present Amendment amends the claims as agreed.

Particularly, it was agreed during the interview, that amendments would be made to the claims, specifically, the independent claims reciting a limitation of "designating by a user a feature of a predetermined object in a frame to be detected in the representative frames" and a limitation of "performing the image detection based on the designated feature, in the representative series of frames".

The present Amendment amends independent claims 1 and 18-20 in the above described manner thereby causing such claims, and the claims which depend therefrom, to recite features not taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 1-6, 9-14 and 18-20 as being anticipated by Yaegashi (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,453) is respectfully requested.

As discussed during the interview, the present invention provides an image displaying method and apparatus wherein a frame image containing a specified object therein is detected from motion picture data based on a designated feature of the object. The Examiner's attention is directed to page 21, line 18 through page 24, line 7 of the specification. Particularly, attention is directed to page 21, lines 22-26 wherein it is described that:

“a processing for detecting the character “x” is performed on this window. Fig. 2 is a diagram for explaining a method in which the detection of the specified character is made with the features of the character defined”.

Thus, according to the present invention, the editor edits video material to make a video program on the display screen of the computer aided video editing system. The editor selects desired representative images 1031-1033 as per Fig. 4 representing a series of frame images. In the screen shown in Fig. 4 when the object detection button 1051 is clicked the window 300 shown in Fig. 2 is opened. The editor designates a feature 308 of an object in the selected representative image frames 305 on the screen. The editing system performs an image detecting processing for detecting a predetermined object based on the feature from a series of frame images corresponding to the selected first representative images as recited in the claims. The display as illustrated in Figs. 2 and 4 shows first information showing that the predetermined object is included in a series of the frame images on the screen as a result of the image detection processing.

The above described features of the present invention are now more clearly recited in each of the independent claims 1 and 18-20. The above described features of the present invention allows for an editor to easily and rapidly find

particular cuts or frames among a vast number of cuts and frames of stored video materials desired for making a video program without having to inspect each individual frame. Such operations are not possible according to the teachings of the references of record particularly Yaegashi.

Yaegashi teaches how to make a hierarchical structure of scenes and cuts on a screen. As taught by Yaegashi, desired reduced images are selected from a plurality of scenes and cuts and the selected reduced images are arranged into the hierarchical structure. There is no teaching or suggestion in Yaegashi as to how to select or detect the desired reduced images. Particularly, there is no teaching or suggestion in Yaegashi, as discussed during the interview, that allows a user to designate a feature of a predetermined object to be detected and for automatically detecting the predetermined object in the frames based upon the designated feature as in the present invention.

Thus, as discussed during the interview, Yaegashi fails to teach or suggest designating by a user a feature of a predetermined object to be detected in a frame image of the representative images as recited in the claims.

Further, Yaegashi fails to teach or suggest performing an image detection processing for detecting the predetermined object based on a feature from a series images corresponding to the selected first representative images as recited in the claims.

Therefore, based on the above, Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Yaegashi whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and

withdraw the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 1-6, 9-14 and 18-20 as being anticipated by Yaegashi.

During the interview, the Examiner was informed that Yaegashi is assigned to the same assignee, Hitachi Denshi Kabushiki Kaisha as the present application. Thus, in accordance with MPEP 706.02(I)(2) Applicants hereby state that the present application and Yaegashi were, at the time the invention was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same person namely Hitachi Denshi Kabushiki Kaisha.

Therefore, as discussed with the Examiner, Yaegashi cannot be used for obviousness type purposes to reject the currently pending claims or the amended claims as per 35 USC §103(c).

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the reference utilized in the rejection of claims 1-6, 9-14 and 18-20.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 1-6, 9-14 and 17-21 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-6, 9-14 and 17-21 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (500.38276X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120